



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ANNUAL MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT

When, five years ago, this society was in process of formation, one of those who had been invited to become charter members wrote the secretary of the committee on organization declining that privilege, on the ground that it had never occurred to him that university teachers constituted a profession. It is to be said of him that he had at least apprehended with entire clearness the proposition upon which the Association is founded. Until it was organized, there was no visible evidence that the bodies of scholars serving in the colleges and universities of the United States had attained what may be called a collective professional self-consciousness. So far as appearances indicated, they were a profession *sans le savoir*. To their local institutions and to the work of their respective sciences they had, doubtless, given abundant proofs of loyalty. But there was nothing to show that they were generally aware of the fact that their vocation imposed upon them, in a special sense, the charge of one of the principal permanent interests of society; that they had a responsibility for, as well as to, the institutions in which they served; that they had as a group a very special responsibility for the policy of the country as a whole with respect to higher education; that the social function of their profession implied a code of specifically professional ethical standards and obligations, additional to the general obligations of the neighbor and the citizen; that the proper discharge of that function was also dependent to a great degree upon various external conditions, and upon the right adjustment of the relations of the profession to other parts of our complex modern social order; and that, for the purpose both of effective action with respect to these external adjustments and of common counsel with respect to the internal problems of the profession, some form of general professional organization was indispensable. There is a sentence of M. Émile Faguet's which is, I think, worth reproducing among the documents of this Association, simply because the most general significance of the Association's existence lies in the manifestation, the diffusion, and the strengthening of a sense of the truth of this saying, among the members of a great profession who had long seemed strangely unmindful of it:

La profession a un honneur, chaque profession a son honneur, qui consiste en ceci, que la profession considère son utilité sociale d'une part; d'autre part les

devoirs particuliers qu'elle impose à ceux qui l'exercent; et, des uns et des autres, extrait, pour ainsi parler, une *dignité* que les professionnels doivent soutenir, à la hauteur de laquelle ils doivent s'élever et rester toujours.*

The fundamental problems and concerns of the Association, then, are simply those of the profession, of which it is but an instrument for collective self-expression and co-operative action. I shall, therefore, offer on this occasion, not chiefly a report upon the current business of the organization—of which members are now kept sufficiently informed from month to month through the *BULLETIN*—but rather a consideration of the bearing of certain recent events and tendencies upon the general situation of our profession and upon those specific interests of society at large which the profession exists to serve.

I. The Economic Condition of the Profession

Foremost in urgency and gravity among the problems now confronting our colleges and universities is one to which this Association has hitherto, perhaps mistakenly, given little or no consideration. Though our committees were already so numerous at the beginning of this year that their designations all but exhausted the English alphabet, there had been none appointed to deal with the question of university salaries and with the general economic condition of the profession; and the existence of a special committee on pensions and insurance was rather the enforced consequence of certain unexpected developments outside the Association than a spontaneous growth. These facts express, I think, the spirit and purpose which led to the organization of the society and have been responsible for its steady growth in numbers. But a situation has arisen which makes it impossible that this, the only general professional society of university teachers, should any longer ignore the economic side of the teacher's calling. The long-continued and steady rise of prices, greatly increased by the war, has as yet been accompanied by no corresponding increase in college and university salaries. While the cost of living has advanced (by the most moderate estimates) between 40 and 70 per cent, and the wages of skilled manual labor frequently in equal and occasionally in greater proportion, the nominal compensation of the scholar has in many cases remained unchanged, and his actual compensation—his "real wage"—has consequently decreased, often to an alarming degree. Meanwhile thousands of members of the profession have, during the war,

* *Les dix commandements: De la profession.*

had experience of new employments, and many have discovered their ability to earn much larger incomes in other callings. At the same time there has arisen a greatly increased demand for the services of men of scientific training in industry, commerce, government and finance. The joint result of these several tendencies constitutes a grave menace to the future efficiency of the American universities. Large numbers of young men of energy and ability have already been lost to the profession through these causes; and it will inevitably be increasingly difficult to recruit, or to retain, men of the highest abilities, either as teachers or investigators, so long as the economic rewards of the profession are not only greatly inferior to those obtainable in other vocations open to men of the same education and aptitudes, but are in themselves insufficient to permit the rearing of a family at the standard of living hitherto customary even among teachers.

The question of professorial salaries, therefore,—whatever may once have been true of it,—no longer concerns merely the private interests of teachers; it has come to be—I choose the words with careful consideration—among the most critical and most pregnant questions of general social policy. The fact that this is not generally recognized by the public at large merely means that the public at large remains incredibly oblivious of the part played by exact scientific knowledge in the entire economy of modern life. Back of almost all the material wealth by which the twentieth century, in Western Europe and America, surpasses the fifteenth or sixteenth century, stands the work of the inventor; and back of all the work of the inventor stands that of the investigator of natural laws. Captains of industry may “organize,” and “labor” may toil; but not all the “organizing ability” in the world, nor all the sweat of countless myriads of toilers, could have effected the transformation of the external conditions of human existence which has taken place within the past three hundred years, and chiefly within the past century. That transformation is primarily the work of the men of the laboratory and the study. And from no other conceivable source can we expect any general and substantial amelioration of the conditions of human existence in the future. A mere change in the *per capita* distribution of the wealth or the collective income of the men living in Europe in the sixteenth century would perhaps have done something, but it would, by itself, have done exceedingly little, to improve the lot of the average man. A mere change in

distribution of the larger wealth or collective income of the larger populations now living in Europe and America, would perhaps do more, but (as is statistically demonstrable) it would still do relatively little, to improve the condition of the average man. Such improvement on a great scale can only come through increased production of the means of comfort, of security, of enjoyment, of control over natural forces. And—in the words of a distinguished member of the Association—"increase of productivity from the use of the same given number of acres, same number of hours of labor, or even the desirable fewer hours, from the same amount of rainfall and sunlight, and in the face of whatever other naturally fixed conditions there may be, can be effected, and effected only, by acquiring more scientific knowledge and using more of what is already known." And not less indispensable to mankind than an increasing dominion over physical nature is an increasing, and increasingly diffused, wisdom in the exercise of that dominion, and in the discovery of the arrangements and adjustments necessary if, under the external conditions created by nature and by modern applied science, men are to live together on this planet with a measure of happiness, with mutual good will, and with such seemliness and dignity of behavior as befit beings calling themselves "rational." We have all of late been forced, by the most tragically convincing of evidence, to realize that man's progress in social wisdom has so little kept pace with his progress in physical science that the latter has done far less than it had been expected to do to increase the worth and happiness of human life, and has often seemed to serve only to render human folly the more spectacular and the more suicidal. In the future, then, the well-being of men must increasingly depend, not only upon the work of the analyst of physical processes, but also upon the work of the disinterested analyst and interpreter of human experience and of human nature.

Obviously, then, the maintenance of the highest possible level of energy and competency in the men and institutions especially dedicated to these fundamental tasks is a matter of the deepest concern to any civilized community. And such a level cannot be permanently maintained by a total disregard of the ordinary economic motives which influence men in the choice of a profession—by compelling men who adopt this calling to do so at the sacrifice of the economic security and the future prospects of their children. While it is true that there are some men whose vocation for scientific

inquiry, or possibly for teaching, is so irresistible that not even actual destitution could keep them from those pursuits, society would be exceedingly ill-advised to assume that these men exist in such numbers as to provide a sufficient number of recruits, of adequate abilities, for the work of research and of teaching. And even in the case of those already in the profession, insufficient salaries mean inferior work, since, as a member of the Association has remarked, they tempt to "pot-boiling, instead of research," converting men who should be engaged in serious intellectual enterprises into compilers of superfluous elementary text-books or hack-workers at the routine industrial or commercial applications of their sciences.

Fortunately, there is no danger that nothing will be done to meet this situation. All the more far-seeing college and university executives and governing boards are aware of its gravity; the alumni of many institutions have already started movements to raise funds, in some cases amounting to several millions of dollars, for increasing salaries; and some state legislatures have made special appropriations for the same purpose. There is, however, danger that in many cases *not enough* will be done. An increase in the prices of necessities of 40 to 70 per cent is not offset by a 10 or a 20 per cent increase of salaries. The teacher still remains far worse remunerated than he was four or five years ago. And there is a good deal to indicate that, in many institutions, a 10 or 20 per cent increase is all that is contemplated, and that when this is accomplished those in charge of the financial management will sit down with an agreeable feeling of having done something pretty handsome for the professors! It is, of course, not necessarily the fault of the executive or of the governing board if the constituency of an institution refuses to furnish funds sufficient to maintain the real remuneration of its teachers at least at the former level. But it is their fault, and also that of the teachers, if they ask of their constituencies less than is necessary for that purpose; if they fail to make clear all that is at stake in the business; or if they neglect to point out that there is nothing in the general commercial and industrial situation which renders it impossible that the sums necessary to save American scientific work, and the teaching efficiency of American colleges, from serious and rapid deterioration should be forthcoming.

The issue is, it is evident, one which must be dealt with chiefly by local efforts. The Association, therefore, as a national body, can only lend some indirect assistance to those efforts. In order, how-

ever, that all that is possible may be done to this end, the Council has authorized the appointment of a Committee on the Economic Condition of the Profession. Professor A. A. Young of Cornell University, who is also Secretary of the American Economic Association, has consented to serve as its chairman. It will be the principal duty of this committee to prepare and circulate a carefully studied and effectively presented statement of the facts as to the present range of salaries of college and university teachers of the several grades, as to the effect of the rise of prices during the past decade upon the real incomes of teachers, as to the inadequacy of present salaries in the lower grades for the maintenance of a proper standard of living, at the present prices of necessities, and as to the general principles which should ordinarily govern the apportionment of the total salary-fund of an institution among the different classes of teachers.

This committee, however, cannot be expected to complete and publish its report immediately, though it is hoped that it may be presented and discussed at the approaching annual meeting. Meanwhile, the subject should and doubtless will receive the attention of all who have any degree of responsibility for the welfare of American universities. And it is to be hoped that those who endeavor to obtain funds to make the needed increases of teachers' salaries possible will rest their case, not chiefly upon an appeal *ad misericordiam*, but upon a plain presentation of the fact that the quality of the teaching in American colleges during the next generation, and the amount and quality of the contribution to science of the wealthiest and most fortunately endowed nation in the world, will depend very largely upon the response of the American public to the campaigns for larger college and university endowments which are now in progress.

II. Compulsory Annuity Contributions and the Salary Question

At this juncture the officials of a foundation established "for the advancement of teaching" have come forward with a proposal for the reduction of the immediately prospective salaries of the younger men in the profession—that is to say, of the class of teachers whose situation is already almost intolerable—by about ten per cent. For the acceptance of the plan for compulsory contributory annuities proposed, and still favored, by the Carnegie Foundation, though not now required of its associated institutions, will necessarily have

that effect. Every penny of the sum set aside for the teacher's eventual annuity will, in the existing financial situation of most American institutions, come out of his salary. There will be a direct deduction of 5 per cent from the income now available to him for the support of his family and for the purchase of insurance for their protection against the hazards of his death or prolonged illness. In addition, a corresponding sum must be drawn from corporate funds at a time when those funds are, in almost all cases, already insufficient for the salary-increases now imperatively necessary; and the inevitable consequence will be the further reduction of the ability of the institutions in which the contributory annuity plan is adopted to pay their teachers adequate compensation. No scheme more fantastically inopportune could easily be conceived. To those who have already entered the profession (since November, 1915) such a reduction of salary would be an intolerable hardship and a gross injustice; for it is certain that very few of these teachers would voluntarily surrender 10 per cent of their present income, and leave their families without insurance protection, in order to obtain for themselves the assurance of an annuity thirty or forty years later—or in order to enable the institutions employing them to compel them to retire on a reduced income at a fixed age. If contributions to an annuity fund are made a condition of employment for those who subsequently enter the teaching service, the effect will be approximately the same as that of any other reduction of average salaries—namely, a falling-off of the average quality of the *personnel* of the profession. Under ordinary conditions, the question of compulsory annuity-contributions is doubtless open to legitimate debate, though even then, in my opinion, the objections to such a plan are decisive. But under the conditions now obtaining, the proposal amounts simply to a plan for the deterioration of teaching in American colleges. It can have no other possible consequence. The colleges or universities which adopt it will merely diminish by so much the effectiveness of a given expenditure of their funds as a means of attracting competent instructors into their service. Not one young instructor in a hundred will regard a promise of a small annuity at the age of sixty-five or seventy as a satisfactory offset to a decrease of ten per cent in the salary now offered him.

Fortunately, few boards of trustees have been or are likely to be so lacking in practical judgment as to fall in with a proposal of this

character. Nevertheless, it has been adopted in a compulsory form by at least six American and two Canadian colleges or universities, including two of the largest in the United States. And in several of these instances this step has been taken by governing boards without consultation with the faculties affected and without their approval. It appears to me to be the plain duty of the faculties in these institutions to protest against such action and make every effort to have the question reconsidered after submission to a faculty committee and a recommendation by the faculty as a whole. The matter is one which, as I have pointed out, directly affects the educational efficiency of institutions, as well as the future character and status of the *personnel* of our profession. That a body of men of other professions should, in any college, dispose of a question of this kind without first obtaining the judgment thereon of the local members of the university teaching profession, is a very extraordinary thing; and if it were done deliberately, it would justly be regarded as a gross affront to the faculty concerned. In fact, however, it is usually done through thoughtlessness, and nothing more is, as a rule, needed to correct the error than a simple reminder of the fact that the question is one which touches both the professional responsibilities and the interest of teachers. Members of this Association, however, are under an especial obligation to do whatever may be necessary to secure reconsideration, in any institution where the plan of compulsory contributory annuities has been hastily adopted without a prior formulation of the faculty's opinion on the matter. For it is the younger teachers, those who have entered the profession within the past four years, who will be immediately and most injuriously affected by the adoption of the plan; and these teachers are, under our present rules, not eligible for membership in the Association. In institutions in which the situation indicated has arisen, the action taken by members of the Association will be a fair test of their capacity for disinterested effort in behalf of their junior colleagues and of the future efficiency of the teaching profession.

III. Academic Freedom

It is abundantly evident that the war has given to what is vaguely called the social question—which is in the main the question of the distribution of the collective income of society—not a diminished but a greatly increased gravity and acuteness. It would, no doubt,

have been fortunate if a social *moratorium* could have been decreed by some superior power at the close of the war, so that the resumption of domestic controversies and the strife of classes might have been deferred until the distracted minds of men had in some measure recovered from the war-psychoses—from the emotional over-strain, the habit of thinking in terms of simple black and white, the relaxation of the power of inhibiting the combative instincts, the familiarity with violent methods, the resurgence and exaggeration of the self-regarding motives after their long repression, the moral fatigue—which are the natural consequences of so prolonged and bitter a struggle. But neither the course of events nor the characteristics of human nature permit such a postponement of social questions until a time when men are in a fitter temper for dealing with them. The coming years, it can hardly be doubted, will be characterized by persistent and intensified controversy between economic groups over the many phases and ramifications of the problems of distribution and industrial organization; and we shall be fortunate if, in the course of these controversies, some of the most vital interests of civilization are not imperilled.

These facts have a special and definite meaning for our profession and for this Association. For it ought to be expected, and it is certainly to be desired, that in such a period of social controversy and class conflict, a considerable influence will be exercised by the men who have given their lives to the study of the social sciences—by a body of experts out of touch neither with affairs nor with popular movements, but habituated to seeing social problems steadily and to seeing them whole, and competent to apply the adequately analyzed lessons of experience to the rational shaping of the future. Such an influence is bound to make on the whole for reasonableness, balance, patience, for the control of social evolution by disinterested and informed intelligence, rather than by empty catchwords or by blundering and lawless cupidities. But the exercise of any measure of such influence by the students of the social sciences—by the economists, the historians, the psychologists, the political and social philosophers—is absolutely dependent upon one condition: that their opinions and utterances be in fact the disinterested and unhampered expression of their own inquiry and reflection, and be known to all men to be such. And this condition, obviously, cannot be fulfilled if the great majority of special students of social problems—who are, in their economic status, employees

of institutions of learning—are in any degree dependent for their livelihood or professional advancement upon the conformity of their views or utterances to standards fixed for them either by private donors of funds for educational purposes, or by the political group which may at any given moment be dominant in the state. The general public is little likely to heed ostensibly “expert” opinions and arguments which it knows—or has plausible grounds for believing—to have been bought and paid for, or to have been delivered under any kind of duress.

It is for this reason that the maintenance of “academic freedom” must be a perennial and essential part of the business of this Association. It is worth while to insist upon this anew, because one sometimes hears within the Association itself murmurings that “there has been too much talk about academic freedom.” There can hardly be too much talk about it until the simple and fundamental principles above recapitulated (they have already been set forth in the two general reports of Committee A) are recognized as axiomatic by all educated persons, especially by all who have anything to do with the management of universities. That these principles are not thus generally recognized is plain. Persons otherwise intelligent may still frequently be heard arguing upon the naïve assumption that, in university affairs, those who pay the piper are entitled to call the tune. Such persons have apparently not yet learned that, by its very essence, a university is an institution in which opinions are not for sale and doctrines are not served to order. They have not even seen that what might be one of the important forces making in the main for intelligence, moderation and order, in the practical solution of social problems, will be reduced to impotence, unless the intellectual independence and the full freedom of utterance of the professional investigator of such problems is effectually guaranteed. Until, then, these considerations become universally accepted commonplaces, it will be needful for us to continue both to reiterate the theory of academic freedom and to insist upon the practice of it.

Both of these tasks require more active co-operation from individual members of the Association than many members realize. Since so considerable a part of the more or less educated public does not yet understand *why* freedom of opinion and of teaching is indispensable to the performance by our profession of certain of its most important and useful social functions, members should take

advantage of suitable opportunities for presenting the meaning of the principle, and the arguments for it, in their own communities. And when grave violations of it occur in any institution, it is essential that the members of the local faculty regard the defense of that principle, and of all the weighty interests of the university and of society which are involved in it, as primarily their own responsibility. There is reason to fear that the organization of this Association has in some degree actually decreased the initiative and the sense of responsibility of faculties, in this respect. Before the Association was established, several serious cases of dismissal for improper reasons were promptly followed by the resignation of many members of the faculties affected. Now, even when gross abuses occur, there is a tendency to leave the whole matter to the Association. But, valuable as investigations by committees of inquiry are, and potent as is the weapon of publicity, in many cases no great improvement of conditions in an institution can be safely counted upon, unless its teachers show plainly that they are prepared to defend the standards of their profession and the permanent interests of the institution, and are ready, upon sufficiently grave occasions, to make all necessary sacrifices in that cause; and unless, also, teachers of good standing elsewhere make it clear that they will not accept positions in institutions in which seriously objectionable conditions exist. Freedom of teaching, like most of the other forms of desirable freedom, is unlikely to be won, or kept, unless those who are its natural guardians possess a certain measure of civil courage.

Yet the defense of the scholar's freedom and intellectual integrity—and thereby of the dignity and the public influence of scholarship itself—is not a task to be performed solely or mainly after critical situations have already arisen. For the first practical requisite in this matter is the establishment of permanent procedural safeguards against illegitimate removals from office—the creation of judicial machinery which shall, so far as any formal contrivance may, render impossible the removal of teachers for improper reasons, while rendering easy the removal of them for proper reasons. The essential means to this end is that every teacher on permanent or indefinite tenure shall, before removal, be assured of a judicial hearing upon specific charges before a representative body composed either of members of the faculty reporting to the board of trustees, or of members of the faculty and trustees in equal

number, chosen because of their capacity to exercise judicial responsibility. The time to establish these safeguards, where they do not already exist, is *before* the emergency arises which demonstrates their indispensability. If such judicial bodies, with adequate powers, had existed as accepted features of the internal economy of all American colleges and universities, most of the unhappy incidents which have in late years been the scandal of our republic of letters would in all probability never have occurred.

This, again, is a task which must be carried out chiefly by individual members of the Association acting in co-operation with their colleagues in their own faculties. Some progress in this matter has already been made, but it is less general than it ought to be and might reasonably have been expected to be. Here, too, members too often, as it seems to me, disregard their immediate responsibilities for the establishment of right conditions in their own institutions, and rely vaguely upon the national organization to accomplish for them what it cannot either properly or effectively undertake, except in support of locally initiated efforts. It is time that, in every college or university in which such rules of judicial procedure as have been formulated in the two general reports of Committee A have not already been adopted, the members of the local faculty should make it their immediate business to bring about their adoption. It will be highly discreditable to the body of American university teachers, and especially to the membership of this Association, if, within five years from now, this elementary and palpably necessary reform is not realized in virtually all educationally reputable institutions.

In this undertaking, however, enlightened college executives should be not less interested than teachers; and it seems not unreasonable to count upon the active co-operation of many of them. The secretary of the Association has suggested that a conference between representatives of the Council and Committee A and a representative group of college presidents might lead to the formulation of a program which would rapidly obtain general acceptance by local governing boards. There has not been an opportunity during the past year for the carrying out of this suggestion; but I cordially commend it to the favorable consideration of the incoming officers and Council.

IV. Professorial Trade-Unionism

It is doubtless the deplorable economic situation of not a few of the younger teachers—and of some no longer young—that chiefly accounts for an agitation which has shown itself during the past year in some quarters, in favor of adhesion by members of university and college faculties to the American Federation of Teachers, which is a “trade union” affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. Some members of the Association have written the officers asking their opinions as to the propriety of university teachers’ joining this body; and others have suggested that the Association itself affiliate with the Federation of Labor. Since the Association has never formulated any judgment upon the subject, no official answers to these inquiries could be given. But this is perhaps a suitable occasion for submitting, for the consideration of the members, the personal views of this year’s president upon the question. The movement seems sufficiently important, especially in some sections of the country, to justify a serious examination of the issues it raises.

What is proposed is not merely that members of college faculties shall adhere as individuals to a national teachers’ union, but that organized “locals” shall be formed in as many colleges and universities as possible; and the eventual result aimed at is, of course, the inclusion of the majority of teachers in each institution in the local union—though I am not aware that the issue of the closed shop has as yet been raised! If the purposes of those interested in the plan should be realized, therefore, the greater part of the profession would be “unionized,” and would naturally be assumed, both by members of other trade-unions and by non-unionists, to be committed in advance to a general support of the policies and activities of the American Federation of Labor.

In my opinion, this project not only is likely to be futile, but, in the degree to which it should succeed, would diminish the usefulness and hamper the freedom of our profession, and would be most of all detrimental to the objects which the supporters of the proposal presumably have in mind.*

My reason for this opinion consists in no antagonism to trade-

* Nothing in what follows is intended to bear upon the question of the advisability of the “unionizing” of public school teachers. Such teachers have their own distinctive problems, varying in different communities; and upon these I do not presume to express an opinion.

unionism as such. The indispensability of collective bargaining for the wage-earner is no longer open to debate among sensible men; and there can be no effective collective bargaining unless there exist strong and well-organized unions, which include in their membership at least a large proportion of the workers at a given trade in each locality. If I were a worker at a manual trade I should assuredly be a member of the union of my trade, unless some seriously corrupt conditions obtained in that union; and I should look with no kindly eye upon workers who refused to support the union while profiting by the efforts and sacrifices made by its members. Nor, of course, is there anything but a silly snobbishness in the feeling that it would somehow be incongruous or unseemly for members of our learned profession to adhere to an organization composed chiefly of manual workers. On the contrary, the most attractive feature of the project of "professorial unionism" seems to me to be the possibility which it contains of a somewhat closer acquaintance and a better understanding between the man of the study or the laboratory and the man of the workshop, the mill or the mine. Such a closer acquaintance should, I conceive, be advantageous to both. Nevertheless, there seem to me to be three decisive reasons, arising out of the special character or the present circumstances of our profession, which make it the part of wisdom for university teachers to be organized in an independent professional body, rather than as a part of a national federation of labor unions.

1. It is fairly certain that, for good reasons or for bad, many university teachers, probably a great majority of them, will not in the near future become members of a teachers' trade union affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. It is, however, eminently desirable that, both for the purpose of discussion of their common professional problems, and for purposes of action, all members of college or university faculties should be united in a single representative body. An organization of university teachers will possess influence precisely in proportion as it is representative; the utterances of a dissident faction are likely to carry little weight with the public or with the governing boards of institutions. Other things being equal, therefore, that form of organization is to be preferred in which the largest possible number of members of the profession can be united.

Nor is it the fact, as some appear to suppose, that an organization which is widely representative and includes in its membership men

and women of nearly all shades of opinion upon educational and social questions, will necessarily be incapable of agreeing upon any common program, except one of futile platitudes; or that it will be impotent to act with energy in behalf of such programs as it may adopt. The history of this Association, during the five years since its formation, is there to prove the contrary. It has been demonstrated that there already exists, on a number of matters of vital interest to American education and to the teaching profession, a very extensive *consensus* of professional opinion; that this *consensus* covers several important reforms which in many, perhaps in most, institutions have yet to be accomplished; that eventual agreement upon other questions may reasonably be expected, as the reports of committees on those questions are presented and are discussed by the Association; and that the Association is an effective mouth-piece for any conclusions upon which a substantial majority of its members are agreed. Certainly it is capable of being an incomparably more powerful agency for promoting many purposes still in need of organized and persistent effort than any organization of a limited and special group can possibly be.

There is a counsel of elementary and, as one would have supposed, obvious practical wisdom, which is too often ignored by reformers of ardent temperament, whether in education or other matters. If a man is convinced of the necessity of six reforms, and if upon three of these he can easily persuade most of his neighbors to join with him, then—supposing him to be sincerely desirous of getting results and not merely of giving utterance to his personal dissatisfactions—he cannot hesitate as to the course to follow. He will devote himself first to a realization of those proposals which command, or which by a little effort can be made to command, the support of the majority; and he will co-operate with his neighbors upon this immediate program until it is accomplished. A man of sense will the more certainly do this if his more widely acceptable proposals are necessary or desirable preliminaries to the realization of the others; and if the carrying out of his immediate program seems likely to leave his neighbors in a state of mind less unfavorable to his ulterior projects. This general consideration has, I think, a good deal of pertinency to the case of those college or university teachers who are disposed to dissociate themselves from the general body of their colleagues, for fear lest a truly comprehensive and representative professional organization should not embrace at once the whole of

some program or set of principles in which they earnestly believe. If any group supporting such a program—with respect to any questions pertinent to educational or professional policy—cannot persuade the majority of their own colleagues of its desirability, they are not very likely to persuade others; nor can they have any claim to address the public as authoritative representatives of the views of the university teachers of the country. They would do an ill service to all of us, and to causes in which virtually all of us believe, who should now seek to divide our forces.

2. A trade-union is commonly understood to be, and usually is, an organization primarily and preponderantly, if not exclusively, economic both in its objects and in its means of accomplishing them. Its characteristic aim is to increase the wages, diminish the hours of labor, and improve the working conditions of its members, chiefly by the application of some form of economic force—usually by the method of collective bargaining. It is, of course, as I have already said, entirely legitimate for the wage-earner thus to aim at the improvement of his economic position, and to use this means of offsetting the strategic inferiority in which he would otherwise be placed in bargaining with employers for the sale of his services. But it is not legitimate, as it seems to me, that the general professional organization of university teachers and investigators should exist primarily for the purpose of increasing the salaries of its members, or that its characteristic and engrossing business should be the application, to this end, of methods of economic pressure. It is true that university teachers—like clergymen, and unlike attorneys, physicians, and artists—are employees, and that their economic position is, therefore, in certain respects the same as that of wage-earners. But they are not, as a rule, employees of establishments conducted for the private profit of individuals. They are responsible officers of institutions created by the state or by the voluntary gifts of other men for public ends—for the maintenance of one of the highest and most important functions in the life of society. To this function the members of our profession are set apart by special and prolonged training. Of this great interest of civilization, as I have already remarked, they, more than the men of any other calling, are the custodians. Members of other professions may properly enough be trustees of a university. But it is the body of teachers within the university who are the trustees of the things for which the university exists; and of that trusteeship they cannot divest

themselves. Their relation to their employment, therefore, differs essentially from that of the wage-earner bargaining with the private capitalist over the division of the profits of industry. It follows that the first concern and controlling purpose of a general professional organization of university and college teachers must be to enable the profession, and the institutions in which its members are associated, to discharge their distinctive function in the economy of modern society with the highest possible degree of competency and serviceableness.

There is nothing in such a purpose which requires us to pretend that professors and their offspring live on manna from heaven, or that scholars have by nature an eccentric taste for being ill paid. The efficiency of the profession, and, especially, the number and quality of its recruits, depend, as has already been pointed out, in no negligible degree upon its economic condition. An organization like ours may, and must, demand that the economic condition of the university teacher not only shall be such as to permit him to carry on his work with reasonable security and comfort and without distracting anxieties, but shall also be such as to attract into the vocation of the teacher and investigator a sufficient number of the most highly endowed youth of each generation. But it would be almost a crowning evidence of a decline of liberal interests among men if we—considering in what activities we are daily occupied and to what needs of mankind we are ministers—should make it the essential object and chief preoccupation of our associated effort to drive bargains for the increase of our pecuniary rewards, whether by means of implicit threats of withholding our service, or by other means.

3. There remains a third and not less decisive objection to the "unionizing" of university teachers. It applies especially to the case of teachers of the social sciences; but it will, I take it, hardly be contended that organizations necessarily excluding them should be formed by other teachers. The professional investigator of social problems ought to avoid entangling permanent alliances with any of the purely economic groups which are now struggling with one another to retain or to increase their shares of the social dividend. Precisely those reasons which require that such an investigator shall be free to utter his conclusions without being in any degree subject to the censorship either of the political functionaries of the state or of private benefactors of universities, also require

that he refrain from identifying himself with powerful bodies representing organized special interests, whether of capital or labor. *His* interest should be solely that of the community at large and in the long run. Not only should it be so in fact; but, if his conclusions are to gain the hearing and have the influence which they ought to have, he must take care to give no reasonable ground for the belief that they are dictated by any other interest. He must, therefore, avoid all commitments which will be commonly understood to bind him in advance to give his support always to one side, in the fluctuating fortunes of the economic warfare which is now going on and, unhappily, seems likely to continue for many decades. If, indeed, it were the case that trade unions represented exclusively a neglected, needy and down-trodden class, or if it could safely be assumed *a priori* that in the future all the demands of organized labor will be just and all its policies wise, it might be well for specialists in the social sciences, as such, to identify themselves unqualifiedly with this group. But it is a patent fact that the great organizations of skilled labor have now grown so powerful that—like all bodies which attain great power, especially if their principal object is the promotion of their own economic advantage—they now contain the potency of grave injury as well as of great service to the general interests of the community. When, in any particular controversy, the trade unions have a just cause, the economist or social philosopher will be to them a far more effective ally if he speaks, not as a trade-unionist, but as an unbiased student of the question at issue, owing no special favors to either side. When, in any particular controversy, the trade unions have not a just cause, the economist or social philosopher, obviously, not only ought not to be their ally, but he ought not to be in a position which, if he opposes their policy, will lay him open to plausible charges of disloyalty to an organization to which he belongs and from which he has received benefits. Above all, the special student of social and economic problems ought to avoid any affiliation which will disqualify him from serving as a mediator between, or a disinterested counsellor of, both parties to the industrial struggle. There is, in short, exactly the same *kind* of reason—I do not raise the question of degree—against adhesion by scholars as a body to the American Federation of Labor as there is against their adhesion as a body to the National Industrial Conference Board or any similar organization of employers. In the one case as in the other, they would diminish their

capacity and opportunity to render, in the grave difficulties of our time, the special and needful service which belongs distinctively to their profession.

V. The Length of Service Requirement for Membership

So long, however, as the present constitution of this Association remains unchanged, one of the arguments which I have advanced in the preceding section must necessarily have an unpleasantly ironic sound. I have urged that all university teachers should be united in a single professional organization. But we still have in our constitution a clause (Art. II, § 1) which makes this impossible, and compels the younger men either to remain unorganized or to cast about for some other body with which to affiliate. This clause, requiring ten years' service "in a position of teaching or research in an American university or college" as one of the conditions of eligibility for membership, has outlived whatever reason for being it may originally have had. It operates chiefly to deprive the Association of a thoroughly representative character, to limit unnecessarily its strength, resources and usefulness, and to produce a natural irritation in those thus arbitrarily excluded. It is, indeed, a manifest absurdity that a man who enters upon his career as a college teacher at, say, twenty-eight years of age should be compelled to wait until he is approaching forty before he is deemed ripe for admission to the deliberations of the local or national organization of his profession. The coming annual meeting will vote upon a constitutional amendment, already approved by the Council, reducing the requirement of previous service to five years. I earnestly recommend that this proposal be altered so as to fix the requirement at not more than three years, and that the amendment be then passed.

VI. Local Branches and Local Issues

Another question relating primarily to the internal policy of the Association, which yet is very closely related also to the larger issues previously touched upon, is that concerning the functions of local branches. The national officers frequently receive from the officers of branches requests for a definition of the powers of the latter bodies and of their precise relation to the national organization. The point about which misunderstanding most frequently arises has to do with the right of a branch, as such, to express itself

upon local questions pending before the faculty or the trustees of the institution with which its members are connected, or to negotiate directly with the executive officials of the institution. To inquiries upon this point this year's president and, I think, all his predecessors have consistently replied that, in their understanding of the matter, local branches have no such right. It is expected that they will in no case take public action, directly and of their own initiative, upon local controversies in such a way as to involve, or even to seem to involve, the Association in those controversies. The reasons, the very obvious reasons, for this limitation of the powers of branches are two. It is, in the first place, manifestly inexpedient that local groups, consisting in some cases of only a few members, should be able to create situations such that the national body might be compelled either to follow courses of action not first considered and approved by the Council, or else to repudiate the action of the local group. In the second place, no local branch includes in its membership all the teachers in the institution or institutions represented in it. All questions which are of general concern to the members of any faculty, ought to be brought before that faculty as a whole for discussion; and public action thereon should be taken only by and in the name of the majority of the faculty, irrespective of their connection with the Association. Nothing could be more contrary to the principles and purposes of the Association than that a part of any local teaching body should attempt to speak in the name of the whole body, or that the members of the society in any university should seek to deal with administrative authorities without full consultation with such of their colleagues as are not members.

While any overstepping of these limitations by local branches would clearly be disastrous, it should, on the other hand, be pointed out that they by no means reduce a branch to impotency with respect to the special problems of its own institution. There are two ways in which it can deal with questions of primarily local interest. It can and, as it seems to me, should, consider and discuss such questions very freely in its meetings and should endeavor, through discussion, to agree upon some conclusion with respect to them; and it may, if it sees fit, informally request any of its members, in their capacity as members of the faculty, to bring the same questions before either a regular or a specially called meeting of the entire faculty. Branch-meetings may very well, upon occasion, afford

opportunity for fuller, franker, less formal and less hasty discussion of important local problems than is possible in ordinary faculty meetings, though if such discussion eventuate in any action or public resolution, it should be through the faculty and not through the branch. A branch in short, should serve as an organ for the formation of opinion on such matters, though not for the official expression of it. Furthermore, a branch may, upon adequate occasion, bring local problems or local controversies to the attention of the national officers, with the request that a pronouncement upon them be obtained from the Council, the annual meeting, or a standing committee, for example that on University Ethics, and that any further action which may seem requisite or suitable be taken by the proper authority in the national organization.*

VII. Local Branches and General Issues

Primarily, however, local branches are concerned with questions of general professional interest or of national educational policy. They are an extension of the annual meeting of the Association; and it may be expected that they will in time assume jointly many of the functions which, during the early years of the Association's existence, were necessarily performed by that meeting. The Council, as has already been announced, has this year approved a plan which for the first time closely articulates the work of the committees, of the branches, and of the annual meeting. Two or three topics are to be chosen each year as the special subjects for the Association's consideration during the year. On each of these subjects either a report, or a careful analysis of the questions to be discussed, will be published in the *BULLETIN* by the appropriate committee; in the light of the committee reports the subjects will be discussed at the meetings of local branches, at least one meeting being devoted to each subject; any conclusions which the branches may reach will be communicated to the Secretary and to the committee concerned; time will be set aside at the annual meeting for the consideration of the same subjects; and the committees may, if they think best, then publish final reports, reviewing the whole

* Situations which appear to call for the consideration of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure may, as is doubtless generally known, be brought to the Committee's attention by any three members of the Association. The Committee also has power, if it see fit, to take action in such cases upon its own initiative.

discussion and recommending further action by the Association, or formulating a conclusion to be proposed for adoption by the Committee on a Declaration of Principles.

This plan, and this plan alone, as it seems to me, affords adequate machinery for the realization of two of the fundamental purposes set forth in the original call for the organization of the Association: "To promote a more general and methodical discussion of problems relating to education in higher institutions of learning, and to create means for the authoritative expression of the public opinion of college and university teachers." It has by this time been pretty conclusively shown that we cannot expect the annual meetings to be attended by a sufficient proportion of the total membership of some twenty-five hundred—which should, within a year, be increased to nearly four thousand—to accomplish satisfactorily either of these related objects. If the pending plan for a system of delegate-representation of local branches at the annual meeting is adopted, these meetings will acquire a more adequately representative character; but even then they will not fulfil the purpose of focussing the attention of the majority of the members of the profession simultaneously upon common problems, or of formulating the considered judgment of the general body of university teachers, unless they are preceded by meetings of all local branches, at which the same problems are thoroughly ventilated. Again, the reports of our committees will lack much of their potential usefulness unless they are carefully considered by all members and taken up for discussion at branch meetings. Some of these reports are educational documents of the first importance. They must, in any case, exercise an influence upon opinion, and eventually upon the practice of teachers or of institutions, by virtue of their character and of the names attached to them. Yet even the most significant information or the most fruitful ideas percolate but slowly through any large body of busy and preoccupied men, and still more slowly issue in action, unless their diffusion is facilitated and accelerated by definite organization designed specifically for that end. Mere publication is, in these days, no longer sufficient; many a weighty report, it is to be feared, will long remain a *brutum fulmen*, if nothing more is done to gain for it attention commensurate with its value than publication in the BULLETIN. It is discussion in the local branches that must, in our organization, serve as the catalytic agent to quicken the reactions of our membership upon the facts or the

recommendations submitted by committees of the Association, with regard to the topics which the Council, or the Association itself, has held to be of such importance as to demand general consideration.

Thus the accomplishment of some of the most essential aims of the society depends absolutely upon the activity of the local branches. But the local branches are, upon the whole, the least functional part of our organization. Not a few of them, indeed, have manifested an admirable degree of energy and of understanding of their important place in the scheme of things. But a good many others seem to keep up not much more than a formal and perfunctory existence, as organized bodies, and their members apparently look upon the national officers and committees as the only needful working organs of the Association. I have heard of one branch which has held no meeting for three years. No great number, so far as reports have been received, have yet made much use of the new plan of special topics for each year's discussions, though the plan was communicated to the officers of branches in March. One of the chief needs, then, of the Association at present, in its internal economy, is the vitalizing of these as yet inert local branches. In saying this, I am not proposing anything which would make heavy inroads upon the time of men whose essential business is teaching and investigation and who are already over-burdened with their present duties. But it is certainly possible, as it is desirable, that every branch should hold at least three meetings a year, and should correlate the discussions at these meetings with the plans and activities of the national organization; and that the chairmen or secretaries of all branches should make annual reports to the secretary of the Association. If all the men, or the majority of men, whose essential business is teaching and investigation take no time at all for reflecting methodically upon the general problems and needs and the external relations of their profession, for discussing these things with their colleagues, and for using their collective power with respect to them, they will presently find that the forces which shape and limit the activities of their profession, which affect its efficiency, and control the general educational and scientific development of the country, will be directed wholly by men whose essential business is *not* teaching and investigation. Upon the vitality of the local branches of this Association it will, in no small measure, depend whether or not the body of actual practitioners of the scholar's calling in America is to exercise any effective influence

upon the conditions by which the future character of American scholarship and the future course of American higher education will be determined.

VIII. The Promotion of Research

One of the two topics chosen for special consideration this year—as was announced in the March BULLETIN—is “The Promotion of Research.” The reason why this topic has an unprecedented importance and urgency at the present time is, no doubt, apparent to everyone. That reason is the impoverishment of Europe by the war. Many thousands of young scholars—the men from whom the chief contributions to knowledge should have come during the next thirty years—have fallen on the battlefield. The governments of the continental countries, at least—scarcely able to assure even subsistence to their populations, and burdened with staggering war-debts—are under the necessity of drastically cutting down their appropriations for universities and other scientific establishments. The decline in scientific productivity is certain to be especially serious in the case of Germany; for, whatever be said of latter-day German science in other respects, the necessary journeyman-work of many of the sciences was, before 1914, being carried on there with greater industry, better organization and on a larger scale than elsewhere. Only one or the other of two consequences can follow. Either the progress of science will be abruptly and immensely retarded—with all that that means even for the immediate tasks of reconstruction; or else the United States must, during the next generation or a yet longer period, undertake to do a great part of what, under normal conditions, would have been Europe’s share of the scientific work of the world.

If we really mean to assume this responsibility—and a failure to attempt it would be a conclusive proof of national degeneracy—we are setting our hands to a huge business. So vast and rapid an expansion and intensification of scientific activity in this country will require very great additions to the existing endowments for the promotion of research and the training of investigators, and will obviously necessitate a large increase—certainly not less than a doubling—of the number of competent men engaged in genuine research. But, among the many ramifications of such an undertaking, one of the most essential is a sort of missionary work within existing institutions, and a better organization of many universities for the

promotion of investigation. That the making of real contributions to knowledge is an essential part of the business of a real university, is a truth not yet *practically* accepted by all those who control the affairs of American universities. It is true that the word "research" has become a fetich for many college and university presidents, and that consequently, in some institutions, numerous ill-qualified or over-worked instructors are bedevilled into producing their annual stint of "titles"—that is, too often, of hasty and scrappy reports of minor investigations, or unnecessary text-books, done at odd moments snatched from an exacting and exhausting teaching schedule. But a university cannot be said truly to "recognize research" until it spends money upon it, as such, and does not treat it as a parasitic industry to be maintained, so to say, solely out of the "over-time" of busy teachers. To support research means to see to it that those members of a faculty who are qualified for it are given adequate time and favorable conditions for carrying it on steadily and connectedly. It means, also, maintaining an eager and constant lookout for young investigators of promise, and giving them, when discovered, special encouragement and opportunity both for improving their training and for devoting themselves to large and fundamental inquiries, to *œuvres de longue haleine*. It is in their later twenties and their thirties that most men are capable of doing their best and most original work. But it is precisely at this age that, as a rule, they are given least time and opportunity for research; for it is the instructors and assistant professors to whom are assigned the heaviest loads of routine-teaching, and it is they who are tempted, or compelled, by salaries so meagre as often to involve them in debt, to devote much of their energy to outside teaching, public lecturing, or other pot-boiling activities. We have, doubtless, by these means ruined large numbers of potentially effective or even notable investigators in their youth. I do not, of course, imply that all or most young instructors show the promise and potency of really productive scholarship. On the contrary, I suspect that a good many who have no true vocation for such work misapply a certain amount of time in unprofitable imitations of it. But what needs emphatically to be said is that scarcely anything should be regarded as more important in a university than the early discovery of all genuine talent for scientific research, and the assurance, to the men who possess it, of every opportunity for reasonably undistracted application to the work of constructive inquiry, while they are yet young.

Upon these matters, then, an energetic campaign of education is needed, among not a few governing boards, and even within some faculties. The National Research Council has already made a beginning at such a campaign, from the outside; it should, at the present time, be one of the first among the *agenda* of local branches of this Association to devise ways and means of giving that campaign the most effective possible support from within, and to consider carefully the local bearings of the recommendations of the Research Council and of this Association's Committees on the Promotion of Research and on Apparatus for Productive Scholarship.

IX. Special Topics for 1920

The special topics for consideration during the coming year should, I think, be determined upon at the Cleveland meeting. I recommend that the two following be chosen:

1. *Means of Increasing the Intellectual Interests and Raising the Intellectual Standards of Undergraduates.* There already exists a committee bearing the cumbrous and somewhat illogical title of the "Committee on the Causes and Remedies for the Alleged Decline of the Intellectual Interests of College Students." The question that concerns us, however, is not whether there has in fact been a decline of such interests, but whether they still fall short of what they ought to be and, without any miraculous transformation of the nature of the human youth, might be. That this latter question, at least, must be answered in the affirmative, seems to me scarcely open to doubt. If so, the fact obviously is one which should engage the most serious consideration of American college teachers; for, as one of the former presidents of the Association has said, "this topic goes to the core of our professional duty, and questions the success of our performance of that duty."

I hope, therefore, that the chairman and members of Committee G will accept the restatement of their problem which I have ventured to suggest, and will be ready to present a first report upon the subject in the course of next year. The discussion of so fundamental and so many-sided a question will naturally continue, or periodically recur, through many years. The aspects of it to which, I think, it might be advisable to give consideration first are these five:

(a) Ought American colleges to adopt the policy of restricting the numbers of their students, in proportion to their resources and the size of their teaching-staffs, and by means of a more careful selec-

tion of matriculants and a much more rigorous elimination of those who do inferior work during the first year? In putting this question, I cannot forbear to quote again from the report of one of my predecessors in office, Dean Wigmore:

One thing seems plain, *viz.*, the remedies [for this condition] must include a free elimination of those students who do not measure up to high standards of strictly college work. Now this free hand to eliminate is practically impossible, so long as we are restrained by the counter-motive of keeping up high numbers of attendance. . . . Back of any substantial reform in the direction of restoring the domination of intellectual interests must ultimately be a repudiation by university authorities of the ambition for size. . . . The time has come for us to repudiate candidly this ideal. Quality, not quantity, should be our aim. And the recent proposal, in more than one institution, to set a fixed limit of numbers is a first move in the right direction.

If this is true—and I believe it to be profoundly true—there is need of a very great and deep-reaching transformation of the ambitions and methods of many American colleges. And I do not know how we may hope to see such a transformation, or any approach to it, brought about on any considerable scale, unless it be through the united and persistent efforts of the members of this Association.

(b) What should and can be done to prevent the engrossment of the student's interest, energy and enthusiasm by non-intellectual "side-shows"?—I need only remind members of what has both wisely and wittily been said on this theme by Professor C. M. Gayley, in his "Idols of Education," and in President William T. Foster's "Should Students Study?"

(c) Is there a needless loss of interest and vitality in the usual undergraduate course, in consequence of a failure to connect it more closely, or to enable the student to appreciate its connection, with his future vocational interests, or with contemporary thought and contemporary problems? Professor A. G. Keller of Yale University, among others, has recently propounded, in substance, this question, and has answered it in a way which will be certain to arouse cordial assent in some quarters, and vehement antagonism in others.

The war [he writes] has revealed to us that there were many economic, political, and social phenomena under our eyes which we did not apprehend or understand, but which ought to have been seen and appraised; as a consequence of the war still other vital questions of the same order challenge us; and now we want the next generation to be better prepared to grasp and deal with them—not in view of war again, but under conditions of prospective peace, and with a view to an enduring peace. It is doubtful whether any studies can aspire to much prominence unless they are seen to have a practical bearing on the art of living. . . . A

crisis has revealed a popular interest in certain subjects—disciplines more advanced than the elementary ones, yet with a character sufficiently practical to be practicable. It is the acceptance and development of this lead, vouchsafed by the automatic out-working of things, that is indicated as a policy of educational reconstruction. . . . The hint is unmistakable to any intelligence not prepossessed; it is time to drop out the educational fads and fancies and to develop those studies interest in which has been evoked by the revelations of the recent crisis.*

To many the tendency of opinion illustrated by these sentences will seem to make merely for the intellectual and spiritual impoverishment of education in America, for its degradation into a short-sighted pursuit of immediate and obvious utilities. But there are many others—the writer quoted, no doubt, amongst them—who, while wholly out of sympathy with any narrow educational utilitarianism and “vocationalism,” have nevertheless become convinced of late that our colleges in the past have, as a rule, made no adequate and intelligent effort to fit the average student to understand the contemporary world in which he is to live, have failed to give him a comprehensive and connected view of the historic processes going on about him, of the ideas now working in the minds of men of diverse nationalities and differing social conditions, of the general results of modern knowledge, of the problems, the dangers and the possibilities of his own age. And those who so think, also believe that our failure to do these things is one of the principal causes of an avoidable deficiency, if not a decline, in the intellectual interests of college students; that very powerful motives in the minds of American youth—their potential if not actual curiosity about the causes and meaning of things they see happening before their own eyes, their capacity for the most zealous application to disciplines which really seem to them significant and pertinent to things which they will presently be called upon to *do* in the world—have been far too little utilized for educational purposes. Lest, however, I appear to be attempting to plunge the Association into the controversy over the value of classical studies, let me add that the question does not seem to me to be solely, or perhaps chiefly, one of subject matter, but rather of purpose and mode of treatment, and above all of the point of connection with the student’s mind. It has been shown to be possible to present Roman history in such a way as to make it illuminate contemporary political and economic problems; it is possible to make Plato’s *Republic* serve as a singularly thought-provoking commentary on contemporary moral

* *The Review*, August 9, 1919.

and social tendencies. However, I do not wish here either to elaborate or to vindicate a thesis, with respect to this issue, but merely to point out that the issue itself is of such significance, and at present of such special timeliness, that it may well be made a matter for thorough and organized examination by this Association, through committee reports, the discussions of local branches, and those of the annual meeting.

(d) What conclusions, if any, bearing upon this general question, can be drawn from the educational experiences and experiments of the war-period? It is evident that a good many teachers believe that the history of the American colleges during the anomalous two years just past yields some positive and fruitful lessons in educational methods—as well as some awful warnings—which are applicable to more normal conditions. A number of interesting experiments have been made during this period, the results of which ought, in any case, to be put on record. There are even some who believe that the S. A. T. C. period, of unhappy memory, was not wholly barren of instruction for teachers, however barren for those who during it were supposed to be taught. And there are indications that those who were members of the teaching staff of the A. E. F. University at Beaune found in this return to something like an educational state of nature hints which may help to produce a greater intellectual vitality, and a more genuine meeting of minds between teacher and taught, in the regular work of the colleges at home. Clearly, all these fruits of a recent and exceptional experience should now be brought together, their value critically estimated, and whatever there is of permanent worth in them be commended to the attention of all engaged in the instruction of undergraduates.

(e) Ought special initiatory courses for freshmen to be generally introduced in American colleges; and if so, what should be their content and method? Here, again, is a question, highly pertinent to the general theme, about which a good deal of experimental evidence must by now be available. Several colleges have conducted courses of this type, though there has been no uniformity in their subject-matter or the manner in which they have been carried on. It would be a very interesting and useful thing if Committee G could obtain from representatives of each of these colleges both an exposition of the ideas underlying the courses in question, and also a candid report upon the actual results of these experiments.

2. *The Government of Universities.* This subject also is obviously one which we shall not dispose of in a year, nor perhaps in a decade; but it is at any rate one which the Association should now place definitely upon its program of questions to be generally and thoroughly discussed. The forms of government of American colleges and universities now exemplify almost every imaginable type, from pure autocracy to systems of genuinely constitutional and representative government. A fairly wide range of local diversities will doubtless always be desirable; but the range of admissible types is certainly not without limits. Manifestly, the pure autocracies and near-autocracies must go—and are, indeed, visibly going, though the process, no doubt, could advantageously be accelerated. That the body of scholars composing the faculty of any university or college should, either directly or through its chosen representatives, have a definitely recognized and an important part in the shaping of all the policies of the institution, except with respect to technical financial questions—this is a principle about which, I take it, there is virtually no disagreement among us. But upon the question how this principle can best be applied, there naturally remains a considerable divergence of opinion. Fortunately, experiments in various methods of applying it have now been made, some of them having gone on for a number of years. The election of members of faculties to boards of trustees; joint conference committees of faculties and trustees, meeting at regular intervals; elective faculty ‘cabinets,’ acting in an advisory capacity to presidents; similar advisory committees attending all meetings of boards of trustees; the election of certain administrative officers by faculties—these have all, I believe, been tried, in one institution or another. What we need, therefore, next to an illuminating presentation of the general principles involved in this question, is a careful study of the actual working of these diverse experiments. Such a study we shall, I hope, soon receive from the appropriate committees of the Association. The general subject is fairly well covered by the topics assigned to three committees: A, on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure; B, on Methods of Appointment and Promotion; and T, on the Place and Function of Faculties in University Government and Administration. Committee A has already laid two general reports before the Association; it is expected that Committee B (Professor W. W. Atwood of Harvard University, Chairman) and Committee T (Professor J. A. Leighton of Ohio State

University, Chairman) will be able to present reports in the course of the coming year. When these reports have appeared, the Association should be ready for an informed and fruitful general discussion of a practical issue upon the wise settlement of which much of vital consequence to the future of our profession and of higher education in America will depend.

ARTHUR O. LOVEJOY.